

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

WALTER BLANCK,

Plaintiff,

v.

WARDEN BAENEN, DR. SUMNICHT,  
NURSE LEMON, SGT. LAUFENBERG,  
SUPERVISOR BEVERLY, and  
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER MCDONALD,

Defendants.

---

ORDER

13-cv-193-jdp

WALTER BLANCK,

Plaintiff,

v.

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER VERDEGEN,

Defendants.

---

ORDER

14-cv-135-jdp

Recruited counsel for plaintiff Walter Blanck's medical care case, no. 13-cv-193-jdp,<sup>1</sup> states that he has not obtained expert testimony by the current March 3 deadline, but that he and the state jointly request a conference to set a new schedule. Dkt. 105 in the '193 case. Counsel has also been hashing out possible limited terms of representation with Blanck on his assault case, no. 14-cv-135-jdp, at which point counsel would seek to consolidate the cases. Blanck himself has submitted a letter to counsel and the court perhaps suggesting that he has agreed to counsel's offer. Dkt. 47 in the '135 case.

I will give counsel a short time to confirm the status of his representation in the '135 case. If counsel seeks consolidation, there is no point in holding a scheduling conference until

---

<sup>1</sup> Counsel appears to have transposed the two case numbers in his letter. Our docket shows that counsel represents Blanck on the '193 case at present, not the '135 case, as suggested in the letter.

we know the status of the '135 case. The expert and dispositive-motions deadlines in the '193 case will be stricken, but these cases need to start moving forward. A new scheduling conference (or conferences, if counsel is not onboard the '135 case) will be held after the representation issue has been settled.

A copy of this order will be going directly to Blanck because he is currently unrepresented in the '135 case. He should be aware that, as previously discussed by this court, he can either agree to the terms of representation offered by counsel on the '135 case, or he will have to represent himself in that case.

#### ORDER

It is ORDERED that:

- (1) Plaintiff's motion to amend the scheduling order in case no. 13-cv-193-jdp (dkt. 105) is GRANTED.
- (2) Counsel for plaintiff in the '193 case may have until April 28, 2017, to inform the court whether he will be representing plaintiff in case no. 14-cv-135-jdp.

Entered this 14<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

---

STEPHEN L. CROCKER  
Magistrate Judge